REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action that was mailed on January 26, 2010. Claims 17 and 42-53 were under consideration. All claims were rejected. With the present response, claim 17 is amended and claim 45 is cancelled. The remaining claims are unchanged.

I.   MISSING RESPONSES TO INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS

It is respectfully pointed out that Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement on December 17, 2007. The Examiner has never provided an indication that the references cited in this Information Disclosure Statement have been considered. Applicant filed another Information Disclosure Statement on July 21, 2009. Again, the Examiner has not provided an indication that the references cited have been considered. Still further, Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement on December 2, 2009. The Examiner also has failed to provide an indication that these references have been considered.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an indication that the references cited in all submitted Information Disclosure Statements have been considered.

II.   NOTE RELATED TO PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THIS APPLICATION

Applicant and the Examiner conducted a telephone interview on June 27 of 2007. As is reflected in the Interview Summaries of record, the result of this conversation was the Examiner indicating that the claims would be allowed if the elements of dependent claim 41 were incorporated into claim 17. At the Examiner's request, Applicant filed a response on June 28, 2007 amending the claims in accordance with the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner responded to Applicant's filed response by issuing a new Office Action on August 6, 2007. Rather than allowing the claims, this Office Action provided new grounds for rejection. Unfortunately, the Applicant never received the Office Action. Applicant was expecting a Notice of Allowance but instead received a Notice of Abandonment. Applicant then went through a long process in order to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn. Ultimately,

the holding of abandonment was withdrawn and the Office of Petitions instructed the Examiner to re-issue the previous Office Action and reset the time periods for filing a response. The Examiner did not re-issue the Office Action as instructed. Applicant contacted the Examiner's supervisor and asked for help with getting this application back into the prosecution process. The Office Action recently received is the action that the Petitions Office asked the Examiner to re-issue.

It is respectfully pointed out that the amended claims herewith are consistent with the indication of allowable subject matter made by the Examiner during the interview of June 27, 2007. As will be described in detail below, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art of record, considered independently or in combination, does not teach or suggest the elements of the claims that the Examiner previously indicated as being allowable. As is also reflected in the comments below, other amendments are being made in order to emphasize additional features that are believed to be missing from the references cited in the rejections of record.

III.   REJECTION OF CLAIMS 17 AND 42-53 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Beginning on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17, 42-45 and 47-53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0156770, which is attributed to Krichilsky, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,225, which is attributed to Bowman. Beginning on page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 46 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Krichilsky and Bowman references and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0101046, which is attributed to Krasnov. For reasons that will be discussed in detail below, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references, considered independently or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the elements of the claims submitted and amended herewith.

Business solution software programs provide an end user, typically a corporation, with a customizable, scalable and global enterprise resource planning solution that supports connectivity with the user's various business partners. Many business solution software programs provide the ability to expand the basic functionality of the software beyond the original product to further

meet the needs of the implementing corporation. This new or additional functionality is provided through additional modules that are written to take advantage of the existing features and existing data contained within the business solution software. Often these additional modules automatically synchronize the software and the existing data with both the old and new functionalities of the business solution software.

Some business solution software products provide the ability to conduct business in different countries, across multiple languages and in multiple currencies. Through the use of multi-language capabilities provided in business solution software it is possible to transmit documents, such as invoices, in the recipient's preferred language. However, changing the language of the documents in current systems requires loading the new language into the business solution software, and changing the entire operating language of the system.

Communication in different available languages of the business solution software is handled through the use of a plurality of labels. Labels are text that appear on a user interface component such as a computer display monitor. Labels can be used on menus, buttons, dialog boxes, for example. The labels in current business solution software are stored in separate resource files with one resource file dedicated to each language used by the business solution software. Further, each module in the business solution software has its own resource file that is not shared with other modules.

Throughout the development of business solution software there has been a strong desire among developers to reuse existing labels. However, it has been observed that it is not as advantageous to reuse existing labels in many cases because, for example, various properties associated with a term of the label can change between different uses or the meaning of a label can vary between different developers. This can create problems when a term is changed. For example, the same label text can be used on a menu in one application and on a button in another, thus resulting in different properties for each label.

As mentioned above, typically, in business solution software modules the labels are kept in resource files. However, current business solution software does not use the generic resource files that are available through database metadata stores, such as structured query language (SQL)

tables or through web services. Typically these labels, in the business solution software, are module specific, and are stored in proprietary resource files with one resource file dedicated to each language present in the module. One problem associated with using proprietary resource files is that when a developer desires to replace or edit a portion of the labels in one module with new information or properties contained in another resource file, the development system does not look for another label in other modules of the business solution software having the same label properties and/or terminology as the desired label. Further, using resource files makes the management of labels extremely difficult due to the large number of labels present in the software solution. Moreover, the business solution software handles a number of different solutions that are developed by multiple vendors. Often, the developers of these modules develop labels that overlap with labels developed for other modules in the business solution software. The costs in time and resources associated with developing labels, and translating (when multi-language support is desired) the labels is high, especially when a label and its translations already exist elsewhere in the business solution software.

With the present response, Applicant has amended claim 17 such that it now recites the claimed new label as being "a proposed addition to a collection of labels that each have a corresponding term stored in the term text database." Further, the claimed collection of labels is recited as being "user interface elements configured to identify a control within a user interface that is a displayable part of a computer software application."

The technology described in the cited Krichilsky reference pertains a system for marketing sealant-related and/or adhesive-relate products using an electronic shopping service. The reference has nothing to do with, as claimed, "maintaining a term text database." When responding to claim elements related to the concept of "a proposed text for a new label," the Examiner points to the Krichilsky reference at sections [0038]-[0039] and [0044]-[0045]. These sections of the cited reference describe the user interface shown at FIG. 4. The interface shown in FIG. 4 is essentially a search interface for selecting attributes of a sealant or an adhesive commercial product. The language amended into claim 17 with the present response eliminates an interpretation of independent claim 17 that reads upon the elements of FIG. 4. For example, the sales process

reflected in the contents of FIG. 4 is in no way connected to the concept, as claimed, of a process that results in "adding [a] new term to [a] term text database, the new term being indicative of [a] proposed text."

The Examiner also cites the Bowman reference with reference to FIGS. 1 and 4. However, the processes described in Bowman pertain to a refining of search queries by suggesting correlated terms from prior searches. Neither of the cited references pertain to, as claimed, "a collection of labels that each have a corresponding term stored in [a] term text database." This is certainly true when consideration is given to the fact that the collection of labels is recited in claim 17 as being "user interface elements configured to identify a control within a user interface that is a displayable part of a computer software application." For all of these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 17 is in allowable form. Dependent claims 42-44 and 46-53 are dependent upon claim 17 and are believed to be in allowable form at least for their dependence upon what is believed to be an allowable claim. Further, it is respectfully submitted that some or all of these dependent claims are allowable based on the merits of their own limitations.

IV. CONCLUSION

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that claims 17, 42-44 and 46-53 are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

By: /christopher l holt/
    Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
    Westman, Champlin & Kelly, P.A.
    900 Second Ave South - Suite 1400
    Minneapolis, MN 55402

    One Microsoft Way
    Redmond, Washington 98052-6399
    Phone: (425) 707-9382

CLH:rkm